REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the July 31, 2006 Advisory Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22 and 29-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,914,695 issued to Walters, et al. The rejection asserts that Walters allegedly teaches each element of the claims. Claim 34 is canceled herein.

The claims are directed toward mapping a resident program to a peripheral device, either by identifying the peripheral device or if the device cannot be identified, then by the communication protocol specified by the peripheral device. Each of the independent claims require if the peripheral device is identified "*mapping from the identified peripheral device to a corresponding one of said resident programs*" and if the peripheral device is not identified "*mapping from a communication protocol specified by said peripheral device to a corresponding one of said resident programs.*" Thus, the peripheral device is mapped to a resident program by either the identity of the resident device, or lacking a proper identity, the communication protocol of the resident device.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests mapping of a peripheral device to a resident program in that manner. The Office Action and Advisory Action suggests that Walters teaches this mapping in column 13, lines 10-52 and Figure 8. However, what Walters is actually doing is using a User ID field as illustrated in Figure 8 to combine the Bluetooth device information to be relayed and associated with a User ID. This is done to associate devices with users which

9

makes it possible to detect invalid device transmissions. (column 13, lines 10-13). An invalid device transmission is not the same as not identifying the peripheral device. An identified peripheral device can have an invalid device transmission. Nowhere does Walters actually discuss what would happen if the peripheral device is not properly identified, and thus it cannot be anticipatory art. Under the teachings of Walters, a device that is never identified would not properly communicate with the computer platform, and would not get associated with a resident program.

Walters describes associating a user account with an HTML interface. However such an association is simply telling the peripheral device where to store data after the device has been identified. Walters does not teach using the communication protocol to map the peripheral device to a resident program if the device identification fails. Again, in such a case, the system of Walters would cease to function. For example, although it might recognize the communication protocol as Bluetooth, if the peripheral device is not identified as a camera, Walters would never know to transfer the images to the HTML interface or look for the User ID.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 29, 33 and 35-36 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29, 33 and 35-36 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 29, 33 and 35-36.

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 29, 33 and 35-36, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-8, 11-13, 15, 18-22, and 30-32.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated August 27, 2006   By: /Robert J. O'Connell/
                                              Robert J. O'Connell
                                              Reg. No. 44,265
                                              (858) 651-4361

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502